

University of Rhode Island DigitalCommons@URI

Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman
Nomination Hearing (1975-1976)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts and
Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996)

2016

Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976): Memorandum 02

Livingston Biddle

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_9

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston, "Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976): Memorandum 02" (2016). *Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976)*. Paper 15.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_9/15

This Memorandum is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

Memorandum -- prepared for Dr. Ackerman
by Livingston Biddle, Staff Director,
Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities

Attached is a copy of S. 3440, which has become the Senate amendment to the legislation passed by the House of Representatives (H. R. 12838) to reauthorize the Arts and Humanities program for another four fiscal years.

The so-called "Pell amendment" to the Humanities legislation has been modified as a result of the Senator's discussions in Subcommittee (which he Chairs) and action taken by the full Committee. The bill as a whole was passed by the Senate by unanimous consent on May 20.

In essence the legislation would permit these options for State-based Humanities programs:

1. Present committees could be continued, provided they established appropriate grievance procedures to take care of responsibly made complaints.
2. Present committees could continue if they phased in a plan to have a majority of the members appointed by a State's governor within a three-year span.
3. A new entity, exclusively for the Humanities, could be established.
4. A State's combined Arts and Humanities program (11 States now have such programs) could be selected.

The Senate bill leaves the selection among these four options up to the State. One of the above would be designated by the State to support the State program. (At present the National Endowment in Washington decides on State-based programs. Senator Pell believes that the States should decide what is best to meet their individual wishes and needs.)

The above represents only 20 per cent of the totals authorized (same as for Arts State programs). The 80 per cent of the funding for national programs would not be effected. These procedures would remain with Washington (as is also the case with the Arts Endowment.)

Senator Pell points to the remarkable success of the State Arts programs: funding levels have increased 15-fold in 10 years, from \$4 million to over \$60 million; community arts organizations have grown from less than 100 to more than 1,000 in the same time; governors, mayors, etc. are increasingly emphasizing that the arts have a central role in terms of national and local well-being -- ten years ago government officials generally regarded the arts as peripheral luxuries.

The Pell-Berman dispute began over the question of State input. In essence, I feel the Senator has lost confidence in Dr. Berman's leadership. He believes Berman has performed passably, but not exceptionally. And he feels, very strongly, that an exceptional ability must be clearly demonstrated, if either the Chairman of the Arts or the Chairman of the Humanities is to be reappointed.

He also feels that the legislation for reauthorization, now pending an early Conference with the House of Representatives, should be separated from the Berman matter. Thus we are concentrating on first taking care of this bill.

You'll note that there is a special new section on museums -- Senator Pell started work on this four years ago; it has at last come into being.

There is also a new opportunity for initiatives in the field of arts Education. The House bill lacks this element. It may not survive; but obviously more needs to be done in this area than at present -- there needs to be a new leadership, I believe, in this field.

In addition, there's a new concept for challenge grants. In the arts area, this could include museums -- and museums are given specific mention in the Arts Education Title.

All best to you,

Liv Biddle

P.S. Excuse typing -- we're in recess and some helpers are away -- but what I lack in accuracy I make up for in good wishes to you.